

Remarks

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 2-6, 11, 16-19, and 22 are indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 3-5, 12, 15, 18, 20-23 have been amended. Claims 2 and 16 have been cancelled. New claims 24-35 have been added. The drawings and specification have been amended. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1: The Examiner has objected to the drawings. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the motor is identified with reference numeral M1 in Figure 2A and with reference numeral 16 in the specification. The Examiner further stated that the drawings do not show a Figure 2, which is referenced in the specification.

An amended Figure 2A has been submitted identifying the motor with the reference numeral 16 and the microcontroller with the reference numeral 14. The specification has been amended to change the reference to “Figure 2” to –Figures 2A-2D--. The specification has also been amended to correct a grammatical error. In view of the amendments to the specification and the drawings, removal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

2. The Examiner has objected to claims 12 and 16-23. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the meaning of the symbol “/” in Claim 12 is unclear. The Examiner further stated that claims 16-23 have incorrect claim dependencies.

Claim 12 has been amended to change the symbol “/” to --or SAE--. The specification has also been amended to replace the symbol “/” with --or SAE--. No new matter has been added to the application. Additionally, claims 16-23 have been amended as previously suggested

by Mr. Anastasi on March 9, 2004 and in view of the amendments to the claims discussed in greater detail below. In view of the amendments to the specification and the claims, removal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7-10, 14-15, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,939,675 issued to Luitje.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of defendant claim 2, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 2 has been cancelled and claims 3-5, which previously depended from claim 2, have been amended to depend from claim 1. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 2 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 1, Luitje does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 1.

Removal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10 and 14 depend from independent claim 1. As previously discussed, Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1. Because Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claims 7-10 and 14.

Removal of the rejection of claims 7-10 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 15 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of defendant claim 16, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 16 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 15, Luitje does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 15. Removal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim 23 depends from independent claim 15. As previously discussed, Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 15. Because Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 15, Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 23. Removal of the rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,432,497 issued to Briski et al.

As previously discussed, claim 15 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of defendant claim 16, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Briski et al. therefore does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 15. Removal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-21 depend from independent claim 15. As previously discussed, Briski et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 15. Because Briski et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 15, Briski et al. does not teach all the claim limitations of claims 20-21. Removal of the rejection of claims 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

5. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,939,675 issued to Luitje in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,804,937 issued to Barbiaux.

Claim 12 depends from independent claim 1, which as previously discussed has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of defendant claim 2. Because Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, the combination of Luitje in view of Barbiaux does not

teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 12. Removal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

6. The Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,939,675 issued to Luitje in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,269 issued to Dannenburg.

Claim 13 depends from independent claim 1, which as previously discussed has been amended to include the allowable subject matter of defendant claim 2. Because Luitje does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 1, the combination of Luitje in view of Dannenburg does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of claim 13. Removal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

7. New claims 24-35 have been added to the application. Claims 24-27 are considered to be in condition for allowance, because independent claim 24 contains all the subject matter of claim 11, which was indicated as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Likewise, claims 28-35 are considered to be in condition for allowance, because independent claim 28 contains all the subject matter of claim 22, which was indicated as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Examination of claims 24-35 is respectfully requested:

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$302.00 is enclosed for the addition of one independent claim in excess of three under 37 CFR 1.16(b) and twelve claims in excess of twenty under 37 CFR 1.16(c). Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,

John Rubis et al., Applicants



Jennifer Mae Slonaker
Registration No. 50568
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 717.399.1535
Facsimile: 717.291.4660